DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 329 335 PS 019 347

TITLE	Child Care Qualifications Review of Canadian and Selected International Jurisdictions.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Toronto.
PUB DATE	Oct 90
NOTE	56p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Caregivers; Comparative Analysis; *Credentials; *Day Care; Elementary Education; *Federal Legislation; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Preschool Education; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; France; *Ontario; Program Characteristics; Sweden; United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

To determine whether Ontario could profit from others' experience in addressing the training needs of child care staff, a comparative review was made of child care training in other national and international jurisdictions, including territories in Canada, Sweden, Great Britain, and France. The following issues were reviewed: critical aspects of child care: the scope and range of legislation; the qualification, or training, programs for child care staff; and the equivalency processes that have been established for individuals with foreign or alternative credentials. In addition, training programs were compared on elements described by child care specialists in Ontario as "essential components" of a child care training program. Methods of data collection included a literature review, archival research, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions. Information regarding legislation was gathered through interviews with directors of provincial/territorial day care offices, key informants, and, when possible, a review of the actual legislation. The "essential components" of child care training programs were developed through three focus groups and a key informant interview with Francophone representatives. Similarities and differences among the jurisdictions are discussed. An appendix lists persons to contact for information about child care in each jurisdiction. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Ontario
Ministry of Community and Social Services
Ministère des Services sociaux et communautaires

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED329335

Child Care Qualifications Review of Canadian and Selected International Jurisdictions

October, 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lora Bratty
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 019347

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Over the past several years there has been a broadening of the skills required to provide child care. Child care staff may be required to care for children ranging from newborns to twelve or thirteen years of age. Furthermore, with the trend toward integration of children with handicapping conditions into child care centres, child care staff may be required to provide care for children who have emotional or physical difficulties, be developmentally delayed, have multiple handicaps or live in a family situation that puts them at risk.

Child care programs were, however, originally developed to train staff to provide care for pre-school children (i.e., 2-5 years of age) and, as such, may not be totally appropriate for the current expanded child care arena. With the mandate to provide appropriate care and protection for children in child care programs, the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) is concerned with ensuring that child care staff have the range of skills to effectively deal with the varied ages and needs of the children.

The aforementioned issues gave rise to the formation of the Human Resources Planning and Training Project. The broad purpose of the project is to address the complex issue of developing short- and long-term strategies to meet the needs of an expanding child care system in the face of a shortage of trained child care staff.

The current report addresses one objective of the Human Resources and Planning Project - a review of child care training in other national and international jurisdictions. (The jurisdictions reviewed include all provinces, territories in Canada, Sweden, Great Britain and France.) The intent of the review is to determine whether Ontario can profit from others' experience in addressing the training needs of child care staff.

Approach to the Qualifications Review and Data Sources

The current review compares the child care arena in Ontario with that of the jurisdictions discussed earlier. The comparisons are concerned with the critical aspects of the child care arena: the scope and range of legislation; the qualification, or training, programs for child care staff; and the equivalency processes that have been established for individuals with foreign or alternative credentials. In addition, training programs were compared with what were described as "essential components" of a child care training program by child care specialists in Ontario.

Several methods of data-collection were used including a literature review, archival research, key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Information regarding legislation was gathered through interviews with Directors of provincial/territorial day care offices, key informants and, when possible, a review of the actual legislation. At the same time, and using the same sources, information regarding equivalency processes was collected.

Information on training programs in Canada was collected in a two-step process. First, Government Directors of the day care offices were asked to supply a list of "recognized" training programs from their jurisdictions. Second, each of these programs was contacted by mail to request calendars and course descriptions. For the international jurisdictions, key informants were asked both to identify training programs and to provide information about the training programs themselves. The training programs were then contacted by mail.

The "essential components" of child care training programs were developed through three focus groups and a key informant interview with Francophone representatives. The focus group participants were chosen to represent a variety of perspectives (government, service providers and educators). The purpose of the focus groups and key informant interview was to have the participants identify

the elements (e.g., content areas, practicum, etc.) a child care training programs should have.

Ontario Child Care Arena

Since the purpose of the current paper is to compare the child care arena in Ontario to that in other jurisdictions, a necessary first step is the description of the child care arena in Ontario. It is important to note, that for Ontario, as well as the other jurisdictions, the description and analysis is restricted to staff training for licensed child care centres.

In Ontario, child care is regulated under the Day Nurseries Act R.S.O. 1980 CIII (DNA) and Ontario Regulation 760 (Reg). It is specified in the DNA that child care falls under the auspices of MCSS. Legislation in Ontario is concerned with both the operation of child care centres (i.e., a centre is licensed and it is the responsibility of the operator of a centre to ensure that legislature standards are met) and the qualifications required of child care staff. While the legislation addresses the issue of staff qualifications, it does so in a general way. That is, individuals can be recognized as qualified child care staff in four ways - by completing an Ontario College of Arts and Technology - Early Childhood Education (OCAAT-ECE) diploma, completing a diploma "otherwise approved" by a Director, being "otherwise approved" on an individual basis by a Director, or receiving a certificate of equivalency from the Association of Early Childhood Educators, Ontario (AECEO).

The "otherwise approved" process (for individuals) introduces flexibility into the recognition of individuals as qualified child care staff. Such flexibility has both advantages and disadvantages. The main advantages are that: (1) it provides a mechanism for increasing the pool of human resources for child care services (beyond that supplied through OCAAT-ECE programs); (2) it affords a means of responding to regional needs and shortages of

trained child care staff; and (3) it can respond to the needs of distinct groups within the population (e.g., Francophones, Native People, ethnic groups) that may have difficulty obtaining the OCAAT-ECE for linguistic or cultural reasons. The main disadvantage is that it increases the variability in the amount and quality of training of individuals providing child care services from region to region and, probably, from centre to centre.

Equivalency in Ontario is administered by the AECEO with funding from MCSS. The current equivalency process involves three steps: (1) a review of an applicant's education in child care against a set of mandatory and optional courses; (2) an evaluation of an applicant's teaching experience (against a required minimum standard); and (3) the completion of a written exam. (The first two steps must be satisfied before an applicant is allowed to write the exam.)

The OCAAT-ECE program is the only training outrightly recognized in the DNA as appropriate to qualify staff for work in licensed child care settings. However, as noted previously, there are other mechanisms permitted in the legislation for obtaining qualification.) The OCAAT-ECE program is a 2-year program and requires either a high school graduation diploma or mature student status for admission. The program consists of both theory (e.g., courses) in child care and practica.

Child Care in Canadian Jurisdictions

Child care falls under the auspices of different Ministries/Departments across the Canadian jurisdictions. In eight of the jurisdictions (Ontario; P.E.I.; Newfoundland; Saskatchewan; Alberta; Northwest Territories; B.C.; and Quebec) Ministries delivering social services play a large role in child care; four of the jurisdictions have Ministries of Community Services involved (Ontario; Nova Scotia; Manitoba; and New Brunswick); and four jurisdictions have Ministries of Health involved (P.E.I.; New

Brunswick; B.C.; and Quebec). In addition, five jurisdictions (P.E.I.; Newfoundland; B.C.; Quebec; and Manitoba) have other agencies comprised of members of various government bodies involved in child care.

The qualifications required by legislation to work in a child care centre vary between jurisdictions. Four do not have any requirements regarding staff training (New Brunswick; Alberta; Yukon and Northwest Territories), and Newfoundland only has requirements for supervisory staff. The remaining jurisdictions require completion of an approved educational program and/or, in the case of Manitoba, a competency based assessment.

New Brunswick, Alberta, Yukon and Northwest Territories do not have an equivalency process and in Newfoundland there is an equivalency process only for supervisors. All the remaining jurisdictions have an equivalency process in place.

Child Care in International Jurisdictions

In Sweden and France child care is, in part, under the auspices of the National Government. In Sweden, the National Board of Health and Welfare is responsible for legislation relating to child care and ensuring that child care centres adhere to the legislation. However, municipalities are responsible for the operation of child care programs. France has separate legislation and agencies responsible for infant and toddler and preschool child care programs. The National Ministry of Social Affairs and Solidarity sets the curriculum for training staff for infant and toddler programs, while the Ministry of National Education determines the qualifications for preschool staff. The United Kingdom is very decentralized with local municipal authorities having a wide latitude in regulating day care.

Sweden does have an equivalency process to evaluate the credentials of individuals outside Sweden. France does not accept individuals

into the child care system unless they are of French nationality, thus they do not have an equivalency process. The diversity of the programs in the United Kingdom makes it impossible to determine whether there are equivalency procedures.

Both Sweden and France have clearly stated programs for qualifying staff to work in child care centres. The most notable feature of their programs is that they are age-specific. That is, different qualifications are required to provide care to children of different ages. It is difficult to make generalizations regarding qualifications in the United Kingdom since there is variation at the municipal level.

Essential Content Areas

The information gathered from course calendars for all programs except university programs and international programs was compared to the list of essential components of a training program for child care staff generated in the focus groups.

Acknowledging that it is often difficult to make comparisons between course titles (or very brief course descriptions) from the child care training program calendars and the content areas identified as essential by the focus group participants, an analysis of the similarity of the various programs reviewed to the "highly agreed upon" essential content areas (i.e., agreed upon by over 65% of the participants) was undertaken. Interestingly, by far the majority of the college programs reviewed covered the essential components. Furthermore, content areas identified as essential by a moderate (between 26% - 65%) number of participants and a fairly low number of participants (less than 26%) were also generally included in the programs reviewed.

Summary and Conclusions

The child care arenas in terms of legislation, qualifications, equivalency processes, and even age range of children across the

jurisdictions reviewed, display both apparent similarities and differences. However, since for many of the jurisdictions child care activities are in a state of flux (e.g., legislation, training programs, equivalency processes are under review) and the information available between jurisdictions is not precisely comparable, it is necessary to make broad generalizations in the way of a summary to the current paper.

A main difference between the jurisdictions is the degree of involvement of the government in the child care arena especially as articulated in current legislation. The legislation in some jurisdictions is quite specific with respect to all, or almost all, aspects of child care, e.g., required qualifications of staff, staff-child ratios, equivalency processes, requirements for obtaining and maintaining a license to operate a child care centre and the like. Other jurisdictions have no legislation directly concerned with staff qualifications - at least with respect to formal recognition of training programs.

It is, of course, not possible to evaluate the quality of child care in jurisdictions with legislation addressing staff qualifications as opposed to those with no direct legislation. Arguably, it could be proposed that the existence of legislation directed towards staff qualifications should result in, at least, a more consistent standard of child care within a jurisdiction. (This point is "arguable" since most jurisdictions do permit exceptions, or "otherwise approved" methods, to the entry to the child care work force.) An important variable, not consistently identified in the present paper, regarding the role of the government in child care pertains to the amount of consultation with the child care community in the formulation of child care policies/legislation.

A surprising, and striking, similarity between Canadian

jurisdictions was the content of the child care training programs. (Information on the International jurisdictions was lacking on this point.) That is, regardless of the involvement of the government in specifying child care qualifications, the child care programs between provinces displayed more similarities than differences. With the exception of one training program reviewed, all programs contained over 65% of the "essential content" of a child care training program as recommended by child care specialists in Ontario.

The similarity between training programs has several implications. First, it suggests that equivalency reviews should focus on the training program of an applicant rather than the applicant per se. Such an approach would be more efficient and cost-effective. Second, in considering revisions to child care training, it seems reasonable to conclude that the review of training programs is more of a "variation on a theme" than a consideration of distinctly different needs. That is, there appears to be a common core to child care training programs and revisions to an extant training program (based on a review of other jurisdictions) would be largely an exercise on building upon the common core.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1
1.1 Human Resources Planning and Training Project . . . 1

1.2 Objectives of the Qualifications Study 3
1.3 Overview of the Organization of the Report 3
1.4 Data Sources 5

2.0 ONTARIO 8
2.1 Legislation 8
2.2 Equivalency 13

3.0 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS 17
3.1 Overview 17
3.2 Summary of Child Care Across Canadian Jurisdictions 17
3.3 Summary of Child Care Across International Jurisdictions 23
3.4 Essential Content Areas 27
3.5 Essential Content Areas and University Programs 30
3.6 Summary and Conclusions 31

APPENDIX

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Human Resources Planning and Training Project

The Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) currently has the responsibility for ensuring that children in child care programs receive appropriate care and protection. As well, it has the legal mandate to establish and enforce training standards.

At present, MCSS has identified a number of issues which must be addressed in carrying out its mandate. An important issue is the shortage of child care staff to meet the needs of an expanding and changing child care system. Recent changes in family patterns and a rapid growth in the female labour force have increased the need for child care. A related issue is that over the past several years there has been a broadening of the skills required to provide child care. Child care workers today provide care for children ranging in age from newborns to twelve or thirteen years of age. Furthermore, with the trend toward integration of children with handicapping conditions into child care centres, child care staff may be required to provide care for children who have emotional or physical difficulties, be developmentally delayed, have multiple handicaps, or live in a family situation that puts them at risk.

With the mandate to provide appropriate care and protection for children in child care programs, MCSS is faced with both expanding the child care labour force and ensuring that child care staff have a broader range of skills to effectively deal with the varied ages and needs of the children.

The aforementioned issues gave rise to the formation in September 1987 of the Human Resources Planning and Training Project. The purpose of the project is to address the issues of the shortage of trained child care staff and to identify the short- and long- term manpower and training requirements of an expanded child care

system.

A major task of the Human Resources Planning and Training Project was to review the equivalency process as administered by the Association of Early Childhood Educators, Ontario (AECEO). The review of the equivalency process indicated that there was a lack of knowledge of the training programs offered in other Canadian and International jurisdictions. As a consequence, the review of applications for equivalency were focused upon individual candidates rather than the institutions in which their training had been received. The review process was, as a result, very time-consuming and frustrating to both applicants and the AECEO. The present Qualifications Study seeks to establish a knowledge base of training programs in other jurisdictions in a manner which will facilitate the equivalency review process.

A second task of the Human Resources Planning and Training Project is to examine models of child care training that are designed to respond to the expanded child care arena. That is, child care programs were originally developed to train staff to provide care for pre-school children (i.e., 2-5 years of age). Over the last decade the age ranges (e.g., infants and after-school children of 6-12 years of age) and needs of children requiring child care has greatly expanded. The Qualifications Study will provide information on how various jurisdictions have addressed the change in the child care arena. This information will be applied to the next phase of the over-all project - the identification and evaluation of optional models for the training and qualifications of child care staff in Ontario. An important consideration of the next phase, which will use some of the information of the present report, will be to assess the role(s) the government should have in child care in Ontario.

1.2 Objectives of the Qualifications Study

The main objective of the Qualifications Study requires a comparison of child care arenas, both in national and select international jurisdictions to that in Ontario. The jurisdictions reviewed include all provinces/territories in Canada, Sweden, Great Britain and France. (The United States was not included in the current review due to the heterogenous nature of the state-influenced training programs.) Essentially the intention is to determine whether Ontario can profit from others' experiences in addressing the shortage in trained child care staff. To this end, several sub-objectives are to be addressed. Comparisons are to be made with Ontario regarding: training programs for child care staff; equivalency processes that have been established for individuals with foreign or alternative credentials; and the scope and range of legislation. In actuality, the legislation provides a context within which to make comparisons. In addition, since the overall intention is to address trained staff shortages, another sub-objective is the identification of essential components of child care training programs. This step will provide a basis for determining which jurisdictions have programs that can routinely be accepted as appropriate training for Ontario child care centres.

1.3 Overview of the Organization of the Report

The main intent of the present report is to compare child care training programs in the jurisdictions outlined earlier with what are perceived to be "essential components" of a child care program by child care specialists in Ontario. The information on the child care training programs in other jurisdictions was collected from course calendars and discussions with experts in the other jurisdictions (see section 1.4). Detailed descriptions of the training programs (and the legislative context in which they operate) are contained in a Supplementary Report entitled

Description of Child Care Training Programs in Canadian and International Jurisdictions. The comparative analysis of the present report is based upon the descriptive information of this Supplementary Report.

The current report has been organized such that the second chapter describes the child care arena in Ontario and provides a context for a comparative analysis to child care activities in other jurisdictions. The review of the child care arena in Ontario examines the legislation pertaining to child care, the training programs for child care staff, and the equivalency process. (The same structure is employed to review the child care arenas in other jurisdictions in the Supplementary Report.)

Using the context established by the review in the second chapter and the information in the Supplementary Report, the third chapter presents comparative analyses of child care legislation, training programs and equivalency processes across jurisdictions. Within this chapter, the essential components of child care training programs (as articulated by child care specialists in Ontario) will be presented and used as a standard for evaluating the various child care programs.

Necessary caveats to the cross jurisdiction comparisons must be identified. First, of particular concern in international comparisons is that the child care arena varies on several dimensions across jurisdictions. For example, "child care" has very specific (and different) definitions across jurisdictions. In France it really pertains to under 6 year olds (and at that, the 2-6 year old group receives educational not care services) while in several Canadian jurisdictions child care extends to 12 year olds. The definition of child care has other implications. If childhood stages are treated differently, each stage may require different staff training programs and therefore different equivalency processes and pieces of legislation.

The second caveat is with respect to the description of training programs. The largest problem in this area has been extrapolating information from rather cryptic sources, course calendars. Particularly across jurisdictions, but even within a jurisdiction, similar courses have different titles and vice versa. Also training components, such as practica hours, are often subsumed under courses where it may not be readily identified. Finally assumptions have been made with respect to the length of semesters (in weeks) and the length of days (in hours). Thus, there is a certain amount of subjective judgement unavoidably built into this subsection.

The third caveat pertains to equivalency processes. Often detailed information is lacking in this regard. In some jurisdictions there are no formal processes yet judgements are still made. In other jurisdictions there are no training requirements so equivalency is unnecessary.

1.4 Data Sources

In order to ensure the completeness of information both within this and the supplementary report, multiple methods of data-collection were used, including a literature review; archival research; key informant interviews and focus group discussions. Each of these methods will be detailed with respect to the "sub-objectives" they address. The data sources described below are those used for both the current report and the Supplementary Report.

Legislation. In order to obtain information regarding legislation in each jurisdiction, several methods were used. For the Canadian jurisdictions, Directors of the provincial/territorial day care offices were interviewed by telephone. Questions were open-ended, permitting probes by the interviewer where necessary. In some instances, Directors, or other appropriate key informants, either

could not be reached by phone, or had requested a written questionnaire. For these situations, the same open-ended questions were provided in a written format. For the Canadian jurisdictions, wherever possible the actual legislation was examined, however it was not always available.

A literature review and archival research yielded the names of key informants for the international jurisdictions. These individuals were selected either because they were knowledgeable about child care within their own jurisdiction or well informed about child care internationally. Key informants were either interviewed by phone or by mail and were requested to forward all relevant documents for review.

Qualifications - Training Programs. A list of Early Childhood Education Programs in Canada was secured from the Canadian Child Day Care Federation. As well, Directors of the Day Care offices were asked to supply a list of "recognized" training programs from their jurisdictions. Each of these programs was contacted by mail requesting calendars and course descriptions. At least one follow-up letter was mailed to programs that did not immediately respond. These calendars, course descriptions and occasional accompanying letters were analyzed.

For the international jurisdictions, key informants contacted in the legislative component were asked either to identify training programs with which to correspond, identify other key informants who could identify these programs, or provide us with information about various training programs themselves. France and Sweden, with more standardized and centralized training, proved to be reasonably straightforward. Numerous sources had to be contacted in the United Kingdom before a list of training programs could be obtained. The analysis followed as close a format as possible to that for the Canadian jurisdictions.

Equivalency. For the most part, information regarding equivalency was obtained at the same time, and through the same sources, as the legislative information.

Essential Program Components. A series of three focus groups were held in Ontario: in Kingston, in Toronto, and in Halton. Focus group participants were chosen to represent a variety of perspectives (government, service providers, education). The sessions were set up such that as little structure as possible was imposed at onset, however the facilitator became increasingly more directive to ensure that all pertinent areas were addressed. In two of the groups, participants were instructed, based on their expertise, to generate what a training program should look like. Because similar information had been obtained from the two focus groups, the third focus group in the series was slightly different. Participants were asked initially to identify current problems with training. They were then supplied with the training programs generated from the other groups and asked whether (and how) this training would address the problems. They were also asked to prioritize the components of the program.

A fourth focus group was held with the Heads of Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology - Early Childhood Education programs. The loosely structured focus group discussions were concerned with curriculum issues of the current OCAAT-ECE programs. Specific issues discussed were the information that was/was not covered in the current programs and how appropriate the ECE programs were in preparing students to work with children of different ages.

A fifth source used to generate "essential content areas" were two representatives of the Francophone child care community. Because of the small number of participants, a key informant interview was conducted, however the questions used were those from the first two focus groups.

2.0 ONTARIO

This chapter describes child care in Ontario to set a framework for comparison with other jurisdictions. For Ontario, as will be the case for the other jurisdictions, the analysis will be largely restricted to licensed child care provided in centres (day nurseries), and more specifically to staff training for these centres. Some general points regarding the description of training programs should be noted. First, calculations regarding length of practica and hours in specified areas are approximations based on assumptions of a nine hour day and a 13 week semester. Second, details regarding practica such as location, age of children and experience, are typically not given in course calendars. Third, as discussed in the overview of the Report, it is not clear what components are hidden within other courses. This has been a particular problem for universities where the language used to describe programs and, in fact, the program names themselves differ quite markedly from the descriptions of Community Colleges. Fourth, in the description of training programs, all programs recognized within a jurisdiction as appropriate training were included. However in those jurisdictions where no training was required, only programs that are of two years or greater duration were included. Also, for conceptual simplicity, wherever possible training programs have been grouped together.

2.1 Legislation

Under the Day Nurseries Act R.S.O. 1980 CIII (DNA) and Ontario Regulation 760-83 (Reg), "Child Care" denotes the provision of services for nonhandicapped children between 0 and 10 years of age, and for handicapped children between the ages of 2 and 18 years. Services include direct care programs, such as licensed private home day care and child care centres, but also included

are support services for parents and caregivers, such as toy lending libraries, drop-in centres, parenting workshops and information and referral services. In addition to these formal care situations, there exists a large informal care (non-regulated) system within Ontario (e.g., provision of care by a family member).

It is specified under the DNA that child care falls under the auspices of the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS). The Area Offices of MCSS have the responsibility for issuing licenses to programs (centres) that meet the standards set out in the DNA.

The DNA lays out specific requirements for a centre. The operator of a centre is responsible for its operation and management, and thus, in order to acquire and maintain a license, s/he must ensure that legislative standards are met. Unless "otherwise approved" by the Director, the supervisor of a centre must have: an Early Childhood Education (ECE) Diploma from an Ontario College of Applied Arts and Technology (OCAAT) or the equivalent of this Diploma; two years of experience in a centre that caters to children of a similar age as does the centre for which s/he is wishing to work; be Director approved. Equivalency is determined by the professional body of early childhood educators called the Association of Early Childhood Educators of Ontario. The process is discussed in more detail in a separate section.

The staff of a centre must also have one qualified staff person for each group of children (whether or not handicapped). "Qualified" may be defined in four fashions. A person may: (1) have an OCAAT-ECE diploma; (2) have academic qualifications that a Director (of MCSS) considers equivalent to an OCAAT-ECE diploma; (3) be "otherwise approved" by a Director; or (4) be evaluated as "equivalent" (to an OCAAT-ECE diploma) by the AECEO.

Qualifications - Training Programs. As stated above, there are currently four ways in which to become qualified: complete an OCAAT ECE Program; apply to the AECEO for equivalency; be otherwise approved by the Director, or have a diploma deemed equivalent to the OCAAT-ECE by a Director.

The equivalency process is intended for persons who have completed basic Early Childhood Education outside of Ontario, or who have other (than OCAAT ECE) relevant Early Childhood training from outside Ontario. The equivalency assessment will be dealt with in more detail in the subsequent section.

Within each local area office in the province, a Director may "otherwise approve" an individual to work as trained staff in a child care centre. For example, where there is a shortage of OCAAT trained staff, and efforts by the operator to obtain one have failed, the Director's approval for an individual who may have credentials from another jurisdiction, a child care related area, or experience in child care may be given. In principle, the "otherwise approved" process is guided by certain conditions. The approvals are time-limited, centre and age group specific and not a transferrable status. In other words, an "otherwise approved" staff would need to seek approval again should employment be sought in a different centre, with a different age group, or after the approval period had elapsed. In practice, these conditions are not always observed.

Also, according to the DNA, a Director may "otherwise approve" a program considered to be equivalent to an OCAAT-ECE. It is through this process that diplomas from the Institute of Child Studies in Early Childhood Education, University of Toronto and the degree program in Child Studies, University of Guelph are recognized as appropriate qualifications to work as child care staff.

The "otherwise approved" process of individuals has proven to be of considerable importance, particularly given the diverse nature of Ontario. For example, Francophones, as a group, face a double challenge. First, there is a limited number of colleges offering French Early Childhood Education (ECE) programs thus rendering this route towards qualification of limited use. Second, the equivalency process is perceived to be strongly influenced by the "English-speaking character" of the AECEO (Réseau Ontarien des services de garde Francophones, May 15, 1990). This unilingual nature has led to several results: to date only a few French ECE programs from outside Ontario are recognized as equivalent (although the list of acceptable programs is in the process of revision); all documents submitted by an applicant are required to be translated into English, leading to delays and cost to the applicant; the examination offered in French has been criticized as a "poor quality" translation presumably leading to unjust failures (Réseau, 1990). As a result, the otherwise approved process has evolved into the only sure mechanism for addressing the shortage of French speaking staff.

Other groups are equally dependent upon the "otherwise approved" process for what they see as appropriate staffing of their centres. For example, Natives have expressed the goal of providing culturally sensitive services "designed, managed, and delivered by Native people" (Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres April, 1989). Elders and traditional people are considered as essential to the process yet they are unlikely to be "qualified" either via education or equivalency. Furthermore, much of what is taught in early childhood education programs either does not incorporate Native values or runs counter to them.

A point expressed by Natives (Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres, March, 1989), Francophones (Réseau, May 1990) and various multicultural groups is the reliance upon child care

centres for the provision of cultural awareness, traditional activities and most importantly the language. These are areas typically not touched on in early childhood programs, nor are equivalency processes set up to consider them.

The ECE Program is the only training outrightly recognized in the DNA as appropriate to qualify staff for work in licensed child care settings. The curriculum for these programs was initially developed in the 1970's. However, over the years individual colleges have modified the programs, presumably to respond to local needs and in response to research in the child care area. General observations based on course calendars can still be made. All programs are two years in length (with the exception of Algonquin College's one year intensive program) and require either a high school graduation diploma or mature student status. All contain a practical component usually split into three or four blocks and total practicum hours vary between 675 and 1820 hours.

Course (theory) hours vary between 930 and 1720. Despite inter-college variations, a sample of community college calendars from across Ontario were chosen to attempt to derive a core set of theory elements. Again, bear in mind this is an approximation based on descriptions, where frequently similar courses are subsumed under different titles.

Across the seven OCAAT-ECE programs examined all offer courses covering: psychology; child development; and sociology (family relations). In addition, most cover special needs; language/English; foundations of Early Childhood Education; Nutrition, Health, and First-Aid; programming; supervision and administration; methods/observation; child abuse and some kind of interpersonal skills training. Refer to Table 2 for a comparison of OCAAT programs with "essential content areas." Note that more than 50% of the OCAAT programs sampled noted explicitly that a

content area was covered if it was checked off.

When asked what improvements could be made to the OCAAT-ECE programs, the Heads/Coordinators of the OCAAT-ECE programs identified a variety of topics/areas that should be included in their current programs. Indeed, 14 different topics/areas were identified. However, there were only a few topics/areas of improvement that received agreement amongst the 17 Heads/Coordinators. (The responses to the question of improvements to program offerings were made independently.) Courses and/or training specific to school-age children (9/17) and infants/toddlers (5/17) were the areas of highest agreement amongst the Heads/Coordinators. There was some indication that improvements in the programs for the areas of computer literacy (4/17) and interpersonal skills (4/17) should be undertaken. In general, then, other than age-specific training, the Heads/Coordinators did not present a strong consensus on the need to alter the current OCAAT-ECE program.

2.2 Equivalency

The AECEO has the responsibility for determining whether applicants with credentials to work with children, other than the OCAAT-ECE diploma, can be deemed to have credentials and/or experience comparable to the OCAAT-ECE diploma and, therefore, can be granted a certificate of equivalency. The applicants may have received training in different jurisdictions, or through different (than OCAAT-ECE) programs of study in Ontario.

The equivalency process as administered by the AECEO has been in place with MCSS funding since 1986. During this time, the process has undergone several modifications. (A complete description and evaluation of the equivalency process is included in the AECEO Equivalency Review, 1989.) The current equivalency

evaluation involves three steps. The first step involves a comparison of an applicant's education in child care or child care related studies against a standard set of two mandatory courses (a minimum of 60 hours of instruction on child development and 240 hours on preschool methods) and three of a further 11 optional courses (i.e., Introductory Psychology; Interpersonal Communication; Family-Child Relationships; Nutrition, Health and Safety; Observation Skills and Research Methods; Children with Special Needs; Infant and Toddler Care; Programming Skills and Research Methods; Specialization in art, music, creative drama, or the like; Family Day Care Administration and Programming: and Preschool Administration and Regulation and the Community as a Resource). The second step consists of establishing whether an applicant has a specified number of teaching hours in a child care setting(s) (i.e., Ontario applicants are required to have 500 teaching hours in at least three different Ontario licensed centres while applicants from outside Ontario are required to have 105 hours in an Ontario licensed centre and 355 hours in a child care centre outside of Ontario). The third step is to take a written exam.

In principle, the first two steps must be satisfied before an applicant is allowed to write the exam and all applicants who satisfy the first two steps are required to successfully write the exam in order to obtain a certificate of equivalency. In practice, there are deviations from this "normal" process of the equivalency evaluation.

The equivalency process is focused upon the individual and not the program in which an applicant has received his/her training. That is, at present, no other child care training programs are accepted as equivalent to the OCAAT-ECE. As a result, an equivalency review can be a costly and time-consuming process.

To summarize, legislation in Ontario is concerned with both the

operation of child care centres (i.e., a centre is licensed and it is the responsibility of the operator of a centre to ensure that legislative standards are met) and the qualifications required of child care staff. However, while the legislation does address the issue of staff qualifications, it does so in only a general way. That is, individuals can be recognized as qualified child care staff in four ways - by completing an OCAAT-ECE diploma, completing a diploma "otherwise approved" by a Director, being "otherwise approved" on an individual basis by a Director, or receiving a certificate of equivalency from the AECEO.

Obtaining recognition as a qualified child care staff by the "otherwise approved" (as an individual) or equivalency processes introduces considerable flexibility into the recognition of individuals as qualified child care staff. Such flexibility provides both advantages and disadvantages to child care services in Ontario.

An obvious advantage is that in times of a shortage of individuals with OCAAT-ECE's, there is a mechanism by which the pool of human resources for child care services can be increased. Relatedly, for areas within the province with a shortage of qualified staff, the "otherwise approved" process can be used to respond to unmet needs in the provision of child care services. A second advantage is that distinct groups within the population (e.g., Francophones, Native People, ethnic groups) that may have difficulty obtaining, or prefer not to pursue, the OCAAT-ECE for linguistic or cultural reasons can become recognized as qualified child care staff. In a province as large as Ontario with an uneven distribution of the population and an extremely diverse ethnic and linguistic populace, such flexibility in recognizing individuals as qualified to provide child care services is important.

The main disadvantage attendant with the flexibility in the recognition of individuals as qualified to provide child care services is that it increases the variability in the training of individuals providing services from region to region and, probably, from centre to centre. This does not mean that variability (in the ability to provide child care services) would not exist if all individuals in the child care area had received the same training (e.g., on OCAAT-ECE). Nor does it necessarily imply that individuals with an OCAAT-ECE diploma will, in general, provide better quality child care service than individuals without such training. Rather, it simply means that variability will be greater than that which would occur had everyone received the same training.

3.0 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

3.1 Overview

The purpose of this chapter is twofold: The first task is a cross jurisdictional comparison of child care in terms of legislation, qualifications/training programs and equivalency processes. This task will be carried out primarily in the form of a summary. More detailed information on each jurisdiction is available in the supplementary report Description of Child Care Training Programs in Canadian and International Jurisdictions. The second task is to evaluate the extent to which the training programs identified in the first task match up with what are termed "essential content areas for training in early childhood education."

3.2 Summary of Child Care Across Canadian Jurisdictions

General observations can be made regarding interjurisdictional variation, however, an important caveat must be noted. To a greater or lesser extent, child care in many jurisdictions is in a state of flux. There are two implications of this fact. First, it has contributed to a lack of information on some provinces. Second, what is described in this report may have changed, or will change in the near future. Bearing this caveat in mind, it would nevertheless be fruitful to group provinces wherever possible for ease of presentation. Table 1 provides a summary across jurisdictions of criteria deemed important.

Age Range of Children. Across jurisdictions there does not appear to be any uniformity in the age range of children addressed by child care. It varies from 0-6 year olds in the Yukon and Alberta to 0-16 year olds in Newfoundland.

Auspices. A question of interest is: Under whose auspices are decisions made regarding staff qualifications? Because not all the provinces have required staff qualifications, it may be more informative to consider which provinces are involved in child care. In eight of the jurisdictions (Ontario; Prince Edward Island; Newfoundland; Saskatchewan; Alberta; NorthWest Territories; British Columbia; Quebec) Ministries delivering social services play a large role in child care; four of the jurisdictions have Ministries of community services involved (Nova Scotia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Ontario), four jurisdictions have Ministries of Health involved (Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, British Columbia, Quebec). Some jurisdictions have two Ministries sharing the responsibility for child care. Both Manitoba and Nova Scotia's Departments of Education are responsible for training programs. In British Columbia the Ministry of Health plays an important role. It is responsible for administering the Act and Regulations, for licensing centres, and registering Early Childhood Educators.

Other Government Bodies. Five of the jurisdictions are known to have other government bodies involved in child care. Prince Edward Island's Child Care Facilities Board; Newfoundland's Day Care and Homemaker Services Licensing Board; British Columbia's Provincial Child Care Facilities Licensing Board; Quebec's Office des Services de garde a l'enfance; and Manitoba's Child Care Education Program Approval Committee are all involved in various capacities.

The Child Care Facilities Board (PEI) is comprised of seven members representing the Department of Health and Social Services, Department of Education, Early Childhood Association, the Public and one Public Officer. Its role is to regulate child care through certifying staff, setting staff qualification requirements and advising the Department of Health and Social

Services regarding standards.

Newfoundland's Day Care and Homemaker Services Licensing Board also is comprised of seven members: the Director of Day Care and Homemaker services, the Director of Child Welfare, and representatives from Rehabilitation and Recreation, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health. Its role, similar to the Board in PEI, is to license programs, to certify staff and to set qualifications regarding staff training.

British Columbia's Provincial Child Care Facilities Licensing Board, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Health, comprises representatives of the Ministries of Health, Social Services and Housing, and Education. It is responsible for the registration of Early Childhood Educators.

Quebec's Office des Services de garde à l'enfance sets all staff qualification. It is administratively responsible to the Ministry for the Status of Women, but reports to the "Ministre des Affaires Sociales." It is a semi-autonomous body that sets standards and regulations and is appointed by the Provincial Government. It is also responsible for licensing.

Manitoba's Child Care Education Program Approval Committee (CCEPAC) is housed within the Department of Education. It is chaired by a senior consultant, a representative from the University system, a representative from the community college system, a representative from the Day Care office which does the licensing, and a representative from the Professional Association of Day Care Workers. The authority of this body is final. Programs entitled to graduate individuals at "professional" levels must be approved by this committee.

Staff Qualifications/Ratio of Qualified Staff to Children. In some jurisdictions, the legislation sets specific requirements for supervisory staff only, separate requirements for supervisory and nonsupervisory staff, or general requirements applying to both. Provinces vary considerably in precision used to define educational qualifications. Several require completion of an approved program and most have developed procedures for assessing equivalent qualifications. In some jurisdictions, the provincial director of day care has authority to approve a worker's qualifications.

Of the 12 Canadian jurisdictions, four do not have any requirements regarding staff training (New Brunswick, Alberta, Yukon, Northwest Territories), and Newfoundland only has requirements for supervisory staff.

In Ontario it is stated in the Day Nurseries Act that one staff person per group must be qualified. As discussed in section 2.1, there are four ways through which one can become "qualified." One can: Pursue an OCAAT Early Childhood Education Program; be granted equivalency by the AECEO; be otherwise approved by the Director; or have a diploma deemed equivalent to the OCAAT-ECE by the Director. Refer to Section 2.1 for more details.

In PEI one staff person per facility must be qualified. Qualifications as spelled out in the legislation can be a University degree in Early Childhood Development or Child Study; a Diploma of one or two year duration in Early Childhood Education; a University degree in a related area plus extension courses; or a post secondary diploma with extension courses. For PEI, as well as all other Canadian jurisdictions, refer to the supplementary report Description of Child Care Training Program in Canadian and International Jurisdictions.

Saskatchewan requires some training in Early Childhood

Development and Programming (Tara Truemner September 20, 1989). In the legislation itself it is stated that the Minister may determine criteria and set qualifications for staff. Thus, there is a certain amount of flexibility built in. It is not known whether there are any requirements regarding qualified staff to children ratios.

Manitoba has a completely different qualification system. The director of a daycare centre, unless otherwise approved by the Director must be designated as a Child Care Worker III and, in addition, have one year's relevant working experience. For the rest of the staff one third must be designated as Child Care Worker II or III. As in Ontario, regulations permit a waiving of educational requirements if it can be demonstrated no suitable candidate is available (otherwise approved process).

Classification as a CCW, carried out by Manitoba Community Services, is based on a combination of academic evaluation and measures of knowledge and skill through a competency based assessment. If an individual has completed a CCEPAC approved program, or is perceived to be functioning effectively, or has completed an equivalent program (two year diploma from an accredited program in Canada) one can be classified at the CC WII level. CC WIII classification can only be attained through formal education after one has been classified at the CC WII level.

British Columbia requires being classified by the Ministry of Health as a PCCFLB registered supervisor if one is to be considered qualified. Registration requires the completion of a basic (one year) program and an additional 500 hours of experience. Qualification requirements regarding staff to child ratios are not addressed in legislation.

Quebec's requirements regarding staff qualifications are

explicitly stated in the legislation. One third of the staff in centres must be qualified either by having a diploma in Child Care Methods or a related area, or a Certificate in Child Care Methods - both obtainable through the college system (CEGEPS). Additionally acceptable are university degrees in preschool education; preschool primary education; psychology with a specialization in Child Development, Early Childhood Education, Child Study, or something else deemed relevant.

Alternatively the individual must have at least three years experience with preschoolers in a day care setting, or relevant working experience at a facility and an attestation of college studies in day care science or a university certificate specializing in infant or day care science. A variety of combinations of credentials and experience are explicitly recognized in the legislation itself.

Nova Scotia requires that two thirds of the staff must have an Early Childhood Education diploma or the equivalent. Details regarding what constitutes an appropriate "Early Childhood Education Diploma" are not addressed.

Equivalency. New Brunswick, Alberta, Yukon, Northwest Territories, all do not have any equivalency processes in place as a result of the fact that there are no qualifications required of staff. In Newfoundland, there is an equivalency process for supervisors who are the only people required to be "trained." All the remaining provinces have an equivalency processes in place.

Programs Recognized Within Jurisdiction. For those jurisdictions where there are specific requirements regarding qualifications, six provinces state in greater or lesser detail which programs are recognized as bonafide for training in their own jurisdiction. For example, Ontario, Quebec, Prince Edward

Island, Manitoba and British Columbia spell out in their legislation precisely which combinations of credentials and experience are acceptable.

Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia do not address training programs in their legislation, however at least informally, the latter jurisdiction looks for post secondary Institutions providing Early Child Care Education.

3.3 Summary of Child Care Across International Jurisdictions

Although the intention is to follow the same framework used to describe Canadian jurisdictions two caveats must be kept in mind. First, in some areas information could not be found, while in others more detailed information is provided to explain the context in which child care operates. Second, as discussed throughout, in some instances international jurisdictions conceive of child care so differently and in such different language that it is difficult both to summarize and to compare. Each international jurisdiction is discussed in more detail in the supplementary report: Description of Child Care Training Programs in Canadian and International Jurisdictions. Readers interested in the international forum should read the supplementary report.

Age Range of Children. In Sweden, public child care includes care for preschoolers and after school activities for school-aged children. It appears that "pre-schoolers," unlike the Canadian usage of the term, may refer to 0-6 year olds.

In France, day care refers to 0-6 year olds. Children from 6-11 years old attend elementary school six hours per day and can extend their school day by 1.5 hours by "studying" on school premises.

The 0-6 year olds are divided into two separate groups. Preschools target 2-6 year olds, and infant and toddler programs target under 3 year olds. Preschools, unlike infant and toddler programs, are considered as educational programs not care services.

The child care system in the United Kingdom is provided through such a variety of models that it is not clear what age groups are addressed.

Auspices. Similar to many Canadian jurisdictions, the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs is responsible for the preparation of laws and proposals related to child care in Sweden. The National Board of Health and Welfare, a central administrative board for matters concerning health care and social welfare services, supervises child care ensuring adherence to laws. Note that, by law each municipality in Sweden is responsible for the development and operation of child care programs.

An important factor distinguishing France from other jurisdictions is that there are separate pieces of legislation for preschool staff than for infant and toddler program staff. It is the Minister of National Education who determines the necessary qualifications to become a preschool instructor. It also develops the training program which is laid out in the legislation. Note, as well, that the Ministry of National Education also establishes policy and curriculum for, and staffs, preschools.

The Minister of Social Affairs and National Solidarity sets the curriculum for the training of staff for infant and toddler programs. It is not known, however, whether training requirements are stated in any piece of legislation.

It appears that child care is extremely decentralized in the

United Kingdom and that local authorities have a wide latitude in what they do. The Department of Health and Social Security appears to loosely oversee the provision of day care.

Other Government Bodies. Across all three international jurisdictions, no Government Body, other than what is detailed under "Auspices" appears to play an important role.

Staff Qualification/Ratio of Qualified Staff to Children. In Sweden, there are different qualifications to work with children under 6 years old than with school-aged children. Preschool teachers and child care attendants work with preschoolers. The director of the preschool centre must be a trained preschool teacher but it is not clear whether all staff working with preschool children must be either preschool teachers or child care attendants.

School-aged children are cared for in leisure centres. These centres employ recreation instructors and child care attendants. Whether this is a necessary qualification to work is not clear.

In France, preschool instructors must have completed a training program at l'ecole-Normale, the National training program for all instructors, regardless of age group they are dealing with.

Preschool instructors are selected for training, trained, and assigned to schools by the Federal Government which also pays their salaries. Students are recruited to preschool training by competition after having completed a Bachelor's Degree.

Staff at infant-toddler programs are trained at local institutions that are federally funded. The municipality can hire whom it wants, so there is more variety in staff credentials than at preschool programs. The heads of the programs are pediatric nurses who have taken a three year medical nurse

program, plus additional courses in public health, child development, and administration. Infant-toddler educators working with toddlers require two years of college, roughly equivalent to a Bachelor's Degree, as well as an additional two year professional course in early childhood education and child development at a specific program called "puericultures." Infant nurses have two years post high school training also at the "puericultures." "Auxiliaires" are the most basic level of infant toddler worker who only complete three years of secondary education and one year at a puericulture.

It is difficult to make any generalizations across the United Kingdom since there is such a diversity of models providing daycare. Although information is available on what qualifications typically people have working in these models, it is not clear whether there are requirements. In social service day nurseries, most staff have NNEB qualifications. In nursery classes, staff appear to be required to have some training in education (although the specific legislation allows for variation at the muncipal or local area).

Equivalency. Sweden appears to have an equivalency process in place for individuals with foreign credentials in child care, and those with credentials in related areas.

Equivalency for preschools is largely not an issue in France since it is stated in the legislation that one must be of French nationality. Since there is only one accepted training for preschool instructors, equivalency is not an issue in this regard either. No information was available with respect to equivalency process for infant-toddler program staff.

Programs Recognized within Jurisdiction. It is not known whether specific programs are recognized within Sweden. However, based on available information, it appears that programs are

standardized across universities and colleges, since the National Board of Universities and Colleges sets the basic content area for the Nursery and Infant Education Program (for preschool teachers) and for the Recreation and Leisure Education program (for recreation instructors).

3.4 Essential Content Areas

As discussed with respect to data sources, a series of focus groups and a key informant interview were held to generate and priorize a list of essential components for training child care staff. Three of the groups developed lists independently, and because of the similarity it was decided to use the last focus group and key informant interview to comment on the list. All groups were asked to provide an idea of the relative importance of each generated content area. In total 30 content areas were listed; these areas were grouped in terms of frequency of endorsement. The left hand column of Table 2 lists the generated content areas, while training programs across Canada are listed across the top. Note, that in those jurisdictions where there is one set curriculum across colleges or where there is tremendous consistency, colleges are discussed as one unit (e.g., British Columbia, Quebec, Manitoba). Absent from the list are University Programs in Canada and international programs, since due to their drastically different structure they could not be compared within the same framework. (These two groups will be dealt with separately.) The course calendar for each program was examined to determine how well the program covered the content areas deemed "essential" If an area appeared to be covered it was checked off in a box-score like fashion.

If one considers Table 2 it is evident that those content items most highly endorsed by key informants are also those found most consistently across programs. However, one large caveat should

again be noted. That is, it is difficult to make the judgement based often only on a course title or a very brief description of whether a content area is covered in a program. Recognizing content areas is similar is even more difficult when the language used to describe them changes, as happens across jurisdictions.

If one considers only the seven essential content areas endorsed by over 65% of the key informants, it appears that most colleges meet these requirements. Quebec CEGEPs, considered as a group, cover over 86% of the components, as do Manitoba Colleges, Newfoundland's Cabot and Fisher Colleges, and PEI's Holland College. British Columbia's colleges and University College cover 71% of essential content areas and the remainder of training programs, with the exception of Red Deer, in Alberta, cover less than 57%.

Although less than 65% of the key informants endorsed nutrition, safety, and health as essential, these content areas appear to be offered by the majority of programs. Similarly special needs seems to be covered by many of the programs. Special needs is not covered in the basic ECE program in British Columbia, but there is post-basic specialization in this area.

Another aberration may be that though less than 26% of key informants had included "foundations of early childhood education" on their initial lists, the majority of colleges offer courses covering this area, which includes a historical perspective, theories and philosophies.

The last point of interest is that "computer" was the only content area generated that does not appear to be offered at any site. Although it was initially generated by less than 26% of the key informants, all key informants felt that computers was a necessary content area for the future.

The interview with the Francophone key informants indicated common concerns, with respect to essential content areas, to the Anglophone community. Separate points made concerned the necessity of having training in French and particularly having French placement sites. There is a Francophone cultural factor that is necessary to pick up from these sites. In addition language development is an important area. It was pointed out that for many of the children, their only opportunity to learn to speak French is in their day care program and it is essential that trained staff have a strong grasp of French language development.

Although the intention was to compare international programs to the "essential content areas" developed by key informants in Ontario, this task has proven difficult for several reasons.

First, as previously discussed international programs operate in a vastly different context. The training situation varies from a completely disconnected number of programs in the United Kingdom to a centralized, standardized process in France, and apparently in Sweden as well. Thus, describing "content areas" in the United Kingdom's programs would be far beyond the scope of this paper.

Second, at least in France and Sweden, training is age specific. For example, in France, training to prepare staff to work with infants is completely different than that to work with preschoolers. Similarly, each day care program in the United Kingdom appears to have staff with different types of credentials. Thus, to talk about one set content is not meaningful.

Third, the language in which programs are described often differs, and it is not clear whether similar terms have the same meaning as those in On Ontario's programs. For example,

preschool training in Sweden entails "teaching practice." Is this comparable to a practicum in a child care setting, or does it denote the sort of placement student teachers in Ontario would have?

For all these reasons, combined with a lack of detailed information regarding training programs, international programs will not be compared to "essential content areas." Again, it is recommended that the interested reader consult the supplementary report.

3.5 Essential Content Areas and University Programs

It was initially intended to use the framework of essential content areas as a comparison standard for university programs within Canada. However, adhering to the framework would not have yielded a true description of the programs for several reasons, specifically, the university program descriptions proved to use different terminology, the programs themselves varied drastically from the community colleges' more applied focus, and the alternative specialization routes possible. Again the interested reader is referred to the supplementary report: Description of Child Care Training Programs in Canadian and International Jurisdictions. Where specified, university programs include placements. However, as was the case with community college programs, many details are lacking. As one might expect, university programs deemed appropriate preparation for child care staff usually are not focused specifically on training to work in child care centres. Rather, child care is offered with a Bachelor's of Education Degree or a Child Psychology Degree. As a result, the focus is less applied, and more theoretical in the academic tradition. This more academic bent also means that universities focus on a general education and it is often difficult to assess how much of a three or four year program

actually pertains to child care techniques appropriate to centres as opposed to teaching children in classrooms (or training to conduct research). An important point to note regarding universities is the number offering French programs. If these programs from other Canadian jurisdictions are considered appropriate training to work in child care centres in Ontario, the concerns of Francophones about the lack of French training programs would be partially addressed.

The majority of university programs offer some child development component, Programming (often referred to as teaching methods), and some aspect of assessment/observation/documentation often referred to as methods, or research methods. In addition, some introductory courses on education seem to be offered that appear to be roughly functionally equivalent to Foundations of Early Childhood Education.

Again, it must be cautioned that the lack of matching between university program descriptions and essential content areas does not necessarily mean that these components are not covered in the programs. Simply, the sort of information contained in the calendars does not permit a definitive conclusion one way or another.

3.6 Summary and Conclusions

The child care arenas in terms of legislation, qualifications, equivalency processes, and even age range of children across the jurisdictions reviewed, display both apparent similarities and differences. However, since for many of the jurisdictions child care activities are in a state of flux (e.g., legislation, training programs, equivalency processes are under review) and the information available between jurisdictions is not precisely comparable, it is necessary to make broad generalizations in the

way of a summary to the current paper.

A main difference between the jurisdictions is the degree of involvement of the government in the child care arena especially as articulated in current legislation. The legislation in some jurisdictions is quite specific with respect to all, or almost all, aspects of child care, e.g., required qualifications of staff, staff-child ratios, equivalency processes, requirements for obtaining and maintaining a license to operate a child care centre and the like. Other jurisdictions have no legislation directly concerned with staff qualifications - at least with respect to formal recognition of training programs.

It is, of course, not possible to evaluate the quality of child care in jurisdictions with legislation addressing staff qualifications as opposed to those with no direct legislation. Arguably, it could be proposed that the existence of legislation directed towards staff qualifications should result in, at least, a more consistent standard of child care within a jurisdiction. (This point is "arguable" since most jurisdictions do permit exceptions, or "otherwise approved" methods, to the entry to the child care work force.) An important variable, not consistently identified in the present paper, regarding the role of the government in child care pertains to the amount of consultation with the child care community in the formulation of child care policies/legislation.

A surprising, and striking, similarity between Canadian jurisdictions was the content of the child care training programs. (Information on the International jurisdictions was lacking on this point.) That is, regardless of the involvement of the government in specifying child care qualifications, the child care programs between provinces displayed more similarities than differences. With the exception of one training program

reviewed, all programs contained over 65% of the "essential content" of a child care training program as recommended by child care specialists in Ontario (see Table 2).

The similarity between training programs has several implications. First, it suggests that equivalency reviews should focus on the training program of an applicant rather than the applicant per se. Such an approach would be more efficient and cost-effective. Second, in considering revisions to child care training, it seems reasonable to conclude that the review of training programs is more of a "variation on a theme" than a consideration of distinctly different needs. That is, there appears to be a common core to child care training programs and revisions to an extant training program (based on a review of other jurisdictions) would be largely an exercise on building upon the common core.

Colleges Covering Content Areas Endorsed by Key Informants

HIGH ENDORSEMENT

Essential Content Areas	Holland	Cabot/ Fisher	Early Childhood Training Centre	New Brunswick Community Colleges	SIAST	College Universitaire de Saint Boniface	Manitoba Community Colleges	Grant McEwan/ Yukon College	Red Deer	Grand Prairie Regional College	Mount Royal College	Arctic College	BC Colleges	University College	Quebec CEGEPS	Child Devel. Services	Ontario Colleges
Child Devel.	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Programm'g	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Legislation		x				x									x		
Communica-tions	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x
Family Studies	x	x			x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
Budget & Finance Admin.	x	x			x		x		x					x			x
Assessment/ Observat'n Documentation	x	x		x	x	x	x		x		x		x		x	x	x

45

46

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MODERATE ENDORSEMENT

Essential Content Areas	Holland	Cabot/ Fisher	Early Childhood Training Centre	New Brunswick Community Colleges	SIAST	College Universitaire de Saint Boniface	Manitoba Community Colleges	Grant McEwan/ Yukon College	Red Deer	Grand Prairie Regional College	Mount Royal College	Arctic College	BC Colleges	University College	Quebec CEGEPS	Child Devel. Services	Ontario Colleges
Nutrition	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Safety	x			x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x		x	x
Health	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Multicultural							x					x	x		x		
Community Plan	x	x			x	x	x	x					x		x	x	
IPP									x								
People Management																	
Program Evaluation	x		x	x	x												
Special Needs	x				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x

47

48

LOW ENDORSEMENT

Essential Content Areas	Holland	Cabot/ Fisher	Early Childhood Training Centre	New Brunswick Community Colleges	SIAST	College Universitaire de Saint Boniface	Manitoba Community Colleges	Grant McEwan/ Yukon College	Red Deer	Grand Prairie Regional College	Mount Royal College	Arctic College	BC Colleges	University College	Quebec CEGEPS	Child Devel. Services	Ontario Colleges
Proposal Development					X												
Board Management					X												
Ethics	X			X	X	X					X				X	X	
PR Skills					X												
Writing				X	X		X	X				X				X	X
Long Dev						X							X		X		
Facility Management		X			X		X										
Computers																	
Thinking/ Problem Solving					X	X											
Psychology		X				X					X	X			X		X
First Aid	X		X	X	X					X			X		X		X
Behaviour Management	X	X			X		X		X		X		X	X		X	
Foundations of ECE	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Child Abuse				X	X		X				X						X

	ONTARIO	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	NEWFOUNDLAND	NEW BRUNSWICK	SASKATCHEWAN	ALBERTA	YUKON	NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	BRITISH COLUMBIA	QUEBEC	NOVA SCOTIA	MANITOBA
Age of children	0-18 0-18- (handicap)	0-18	0-16	?	6wks-12 years	? 0 to under 6	0-6	0-11	<36months - school		0-7	12 weeks - 12 years
Auspices	Ministry of Community and Social Services	Dept. of Health and Social Services	Ministry of Social Services	Dept. of Health and Community Services	Dept. of Social Services	Ministry of Family and Social Services	?	Dept. of Social Services does Security checks	Ministry of Social Services & Housing *Ministry of Health	Ministry of Health & Social Services	old-Ministry of Social Services new-Dept. of Community Services; Dept. of Ed is responsible for training programs	Manitoba Community Services & Manitoba Education
Other Government Bodies)	No	Child Care Facilities Board	Day Care and Homemaker Services Licensing Board	No	No	NO	?		Provincial Child Care Facilities Board (PCCFB)	Office des Services de garde a l'enfance		Child Care Education & Program Approval Comitee (within Dept. of Education
(a) who:	not applicable	7 members from: -Dept. of Health & Social Services -Dept. of Education -Early Child Association -Public -Public Office	7 members from: -Dir. of Day care & Homemaker Services -Dir. of Child Welfare -Rep of Rehabilitation & Recreation -Dept. of Ed -Dept of Health	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	?		Representatives from: Min of Health Min of SSAR Min of Ed (note, Board is under responsibility of Ministry of Health)	?		Representatives from: -University -Community College -Day Care Office -Professional Assoc. of Day Care Workers
(b) role:	not applicable	-regulates child care -licenses -certifies staff -*sets qualifications -advises on standards	-licenses -certifies staff -sets qualifications	Not applicable	Not aplicable	Not applicable	?		-certifies -licenses	-licenses		-Accreditation committee approves programs

	ONTARIO	PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND	NEWFOUNDLAND	NEW BRUNSWICK	SASKATCHEWAN	ALBERTA	YUKON	NORTHWEST TERRITORIES	BRITISH COLUMBIA	QUEBEC	NOVA SCOTIA	MANITOBA
Staff Qualifications	-ECE or equivalent -Otherwise Approved	-University degree in ECD or Child Study -Diploma in ECE, 1 or 2 yrs. -University in related area & extension -post secondary & immersion	Only supervisor must be qualified	None	Some training in ECD & programming According to Legislation: Minister may determine criteria & set qualifications	None	None	None	PCCFLB Registered Supervisor must complete basic training & 500 hrs.	-DEC -CEC -University degree in preschool education	Early Childhood Education or equivalent	CCVII CCVIII -competency based or formal education -otherwise approved
Ratio of qualified staff	1 per group	1 per facility	not applicable	not applicable	not available	Not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not stated	1/3 of staff must have ECE or equivalent	2/3 must have ECE or equivalent	2/3 CCVII, CCVIII
Legislation	Day Nurseries Act	Child Care Facilities Act (1987); Regs (1987)	Day Care & Homemaker Services Act 1975; Regs 1982	Family Services Act 1983; Reg 83-85	Old: Family Services Act & Child Care Regs. New: The Child Care Act	-Social Care Facilities Licensing Act (1980) -Day Care Regs (1981)	-Day Care Act -Day Care Centre Regs (1982) -Family Day Home Regs (1986)	-Child Day Care Act (1987) -Child Day Care Standards Reg.	-Community Care Facilities Act (1988) -Child Care Regs (1989)	Loi sur les services de garde a l'enfance Regiments	-Day Care Act (1978) -Day Care Regs (1979)	The Community Child Day Care Standards Act Manitoba Regs 1986
Equivalency	Yes	Yes	Yes (for Supervisor)	No	Yes	None	None	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Specific Training Recognized in Legislation	OCAAT-ECE	1 & 2 year Early Childhood Development diplomas or Child Study	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not stated specifically	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Basic & Post Basic Programs	CEGEPS & Universities	Post secondary institutions providing ECE (not stated in legislation)	-Community College programs in daycare (U) -U. of Manitoba -U. of Winnipeg B.A. in Dev. Psych.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contact people for information about child care in each jurisdiction.

Prince Edward Island

Cathy McCormack - Assistant Coordinator
Division of Child and Family Services
Department of Social Services

British Columbia

Gayle Davies - Program Manager
Community Care Facilities Licensing
Ministry of Health

Peggy Accomba
Ministry of Social Services and Housing

Nova Scotia

Gregory Gammon - Director of Day Care Services
Family and Children's Services Division
Department of Social Services

Yukon

Debbie Mauch - Day Care Coordinator
Day Care Services Board
Department of Health and Human Resources

Alberta

Dennis Maier - Director
Community Day Programs
Department of Social Services and Community Health

North West Territories

Deb O'Connell - Consultant on Day Care
Department of Social Services

Manitoba

Richard Asselin - Assistant Director
Day Care
Department of Community Services

Winona Kling
Qualifications Co-ordinator
Dept. of Community Services

Saskatchewan

Tara Truemner
Child Care Branch
Department of Social Services

Quebec

Ginette Galarneau
Head of Research and Development
Office des services de garde à l'enfance

Newfoundland

Vivian Randell - Director of Day Care and Homemaker Services
Dept. of Social Services

New Brunswick

Diane Lutes - Provincial Coordinator
Early Childhood Section
Department of Health and Community Services

Sweden

Asa Cornelius - Head
National Board of Universities and Colleges

France

Elisabeth Marx
French-American Foundation

J. Roche
Director of National Training Program for Preschool Instructors
in France

United Kingdom

June Deller
Key informant on internal child care